IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL

W.P. No. 589 of 2003 (S/B)

Smt. Rajeshwari Rathore,

W/o Shri Sundar Lal …….. Petitioner

V/s

State & others …….. Respondents

Mr. P.M.N. Singh, learned Advocate for the petitioner
Learned Chief Standing Counsel for the State.

Hon. P.C. Verma, A.C.J.

Hon. Rajesh Tandon, J.

Heard Me. P.M.N. Singh, learned Advocate for the petitioner and learned Chief Standing for the State.

By means of this writ petition, the petitioner has prayed for the reliefs:

i. Issue a writ order or direction in the nature of certiorari quashing the order dated 27.09.2001 and 22.1.2003.

ii. Issue a writ order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding the respondents to hand over the full fledge charge of the post of Principal G.G.I.C. Kotdwar, Pauri Garhwal and not to interfere with her functioning in any manner.

iii. Issue a writ order or direction in the nature of certiorari quashing the entire disciplinary proceedings against the petitioner arising from order dated 27.9.2001.

iv. Issue a writ order or direction in the nature of mandamus for payment of entire salary along with 9% compound interest along with medical bills from 27.9. 2001 till actual date of payment.

v. To punish respondent no. 2 in exercise of jurisdiction under article 215 Constitution of India and further to hold a judicial enquiry and punish his associates and subordinate guilty of filing false affidavit before this Hon'ble court and also of guilty of demanding illegal gratification in writing from the petitioner.

vi. Issue a order awarding cost to the tune of Rs. 1 lac 50 thousand for contesting four writ petitions and 2 contempt applications only on account of continued willful disobeydience of the orders of this Hon'ble Court.

vii. Issue a direction to respondent No. 1 to register necessary FIR in cases of demanding money which stands prove by own affidavit filed by respondents themselves and to prosecute them in accordance with law.

viii. Issue any other order or direction which this Hon'ble court may deem fit and proper under the facts and circumstances of the case.

ix. Award cost of the writ petition in favour of the petitioner throughout.

Relief clause itself shows the plurality of causes of action, which is not permitted to be prayed in a single writ petition. Therefore, it is open for the petitioner to file a fresh writ petition for each cause of action. On account of the plurality of causes of action, we are not inclined to entertain the petition and the petition is dismissed accordingly.

Learned counsel for the petitioner prayed for relief to approach the Supreme Court. However, in view of the amendment in the Constitution, now relief is not required to be granted by this Court. However, since we have not decided any question, relief prayed for is refused.

(P.C. Verma, A.C.J.)

(Rajesh Tandon, J.)

Dt. 30.12.2003.

G